Frankfort Architectural Review Board

February 21, 2006

Members Present: Dwayne Cook

John Downs

Roger Stapleton (3)

Members Absent: Andy Casebier

Joe Johnson (2)

There being a quorum, the meeting proceeded and was called to order by Chairman Stapleton.

A motion was made by Mr. Cook to approve the minutes of the meeting of December 13, 2005. The motion was seconded by John Downs and carried unanimously.

The first item of business was a request from Mary F. Slaughter for a conditional use permit relating to a major home occupation to allow massage and craniosacral therapy at 112 Shelby Street. Mr. Robert Hewitt, Planning Supervisor, was present for the report. He stated the proposed activity, as described by the applicant, would occur entirely within the structure and have a separate entrance into the treatment room from the rear of the house. He stated the use was not likely to pose an adverse effect on the adjacent or surrounding property.

Mr. Stapleton asked if there were any other businesses on that street. Mr. Hewitt stated he did not recall any other conditional use permits.

Mary Frank Slaughter was present and stated she had talked to seven people on her street and they had no problem with her request. She stated she works for a chiropractor full time. She stated she would have about three or four clients per week. She stated her neighbor had come with her and had no problems with the request. Ms. Slaughter stated she had no problems with staff's conditions.

Ms. Ruth Jones, next door neighbor, was present and stated she had no objections.

A motion was made by Dwayne Cook to approve the request with the seven staff conditions being met: a. the conditional use permit applies only for massage & craniosacral therapy within the principal structure only; b. the conditional use is permitted only at 112 Shelby St; c. the conditional use is granted only to Mary F. Slaughter; d. the conditional use is not transferable and any change in ownership or use will make this approval null and void; e. that any signage comply with the requirements of Section 19.072 B of the Zoning Ordinance unless otherwise authorized by variance procedure; f. the applicant shall obtain a city business license; g. the hours of operation

shall be from 8:00 am t 9:00 pm. The motion was seconded by John Downs and carried unanimously.

The next item on the agenda was a request from Tom Bean of Shaker Hill Properties LLC, Inc. for a certificate of appropriateness to allow miscellaneous exterior renovations to the principal structure and the construction of an off street parking lot at 526 Shelby Street. Mr. Robert Hewitt was again present for the staff presentation. He stated the applicant proposes to replicate the rear elevation of the principal structure back to the original arrangement; install hardiboard siding to replace the existing asbestos siding; remove the existing one car detached garage; install an off-street parking lot to accommodate three vehicles. Mr. Hewitt stated it is the intent of the applicant to convert the existing structure for use as professional offices. Mr. Hewitt stated it should be discussed on the use of hardiboard; the amount of open space in the rear yard and the screening of the parking lot table. Mr. Hewitt stated he recommended approval with conditions outlined in the staff report.

Ms. Teresa Rollins was present and asked why a two foot variance had been allowed when the buffer requirement is five feet. Mr. Hewitt stated the variance has not been granted. He stated the engineer's plans show two feet and it does require an additional three feet. Ms. Rollins also asked why a two foot setback from the property line on the parking lot was allowed. Mr. Hewitt stated that he wanted to change his item 3 in the staff report to be a five foot setback from the property lines on the parking lot.

Mr. Tom Bean, applicant, was present. He brought a sample color of the hardiboard. He stated he is going back to the original on the back porch. He stated the bottom is open and the upper porch is enclosed. Ms. Rollins asked what the width of the parking spaces would be. Mr. Bean and Mr. Hewitt stated 9 x 18 feet. Ms. Rollins asked if there was a handicap spot and stated there should be one. Mr. Bean stated he would do whatever was needed and required. Ms. Rollins asked how much yard would be left. Mr. Bean stated he was not sure. Mr. Edwin Logan, Board Attorney, stated the building inspector would cover the handicap parking requirements.

Mr. Gary Hager asked if the vehicles in the parking lot would have to pull in and turn around or back out. Mr. Bean stated they can back in the spot under the house and back out. Mr. Hager stated he was concerned about backing out. Mr. Bean stated he would use pavers for the parking lot. Mr. Hager asked how much water would run off. Mr. Bean stated very little more than what is there now. He stated the pavers would help with that and that the water would go in between the pavers rather than run off toward the street. Mr. Bean stated he does not intend to turn the property into apartments.

Mr. Hager stated he was concerned about water run off, room for vehicles without backing onto the street and the property being turned into an apartment complex.

Ken Rollins, 205 West Todd, was present and stated he was opposed to the parking lot. He stated it would affect the character of the area. Mr. Rollins stated the rear elevation renovations would alter the view from his living room. He added there would be a pear tree, crepe myrtle and a holly tree removed. He added he was concerned with water run off and protection of the street rhythm.

Mr. Downs asked if there was enough space for three parking spaces, a five foot setback and space to turn around. Mr. Hewitt stated yes. Mr. Downs asked where the air conditioning units would go. Mr. Bean stated he did not know yet. He added he would not be opposed to lattice type pavers. Mr. Cook asked if the applicant was requesting three parking spaces. Mr. Hewitt stated yes. Mr. Hewitt added he would like to have wheel stops added so if the grass grows tall due to the concrete pavers. Mr. Hewitt added the refuse containers and HVAC would be reviewed under the conditional use permit application.

A motion was made by Mr. Cook to approve the request with the following conditions: a. the additional information requested by staff in articles 4.418 (A) and (B) is submitted for review and is in compliance with the design guidelines contained in articles 4 & 17 of the Zoning Ordinance; b. the parking lot is constructed from concrete lattice pavers and has wheel stops; c. the parking lot shall maintain a five foot setback from the property lines; d. the landscape plan be approved administratively. The motion was seconded by Mr. Downs and carried unanimously.

The final item of business was a request by the City of Frankfort Planning & Building Codes Department for approval of the placement of historic district boundary signs within the Special Capital, Special Historic and Central Business districts. Mr. Robert Hewitt stated there are seven signs proposed along the roadway in areas intended to be visible by both the motoring and pedestrian traffic. Mr. Robert Hewitt stated staff recommended that the signs be located within existing rights-of-way at the entrances to the Special Capital, Special Historic and Central Business districts. He added a transportation encroachment permit must be obtained from the Transportation Cabinet for any sign within any state right of way.

A motion was made by John Downs to recommend to the staff that they take their design ideas to the City Manager with the approval of the Architectural Review Board for their basic design and their whole concept idea for the project. The motion was seconded by Mr. Cook and carried unanimously.

| Mr. Stapleton stated this is something that has been | needed. | He |
|---|---------|-------|
| also asked if the ARB would be approached on the EOC building design. | Mr. Mu | ıller |
| stated no that it is not within an historic district. He added they are taking co | mments. | |

 $\label{eq:condition} A \ \ motion \ \ was \ \ made \ Mr. \ Cook \ to \ adjourn. \ \ The \ \ motion \ \ was seconded by Mr. \ Downs \ and \ carried \ unanimously.$

Chairman